UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,412	06/23/2000	Melvin Richard Zimowski	ST9-99-080	9095

23373	7590	11/07/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/602,412	ZIMOWSKI, MELVIN RICHARD
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quang N. Nguyen	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 October 2006_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,3-13,15-25 and 27-40_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,3-13,15-25 and 27-40_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _25 September 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.   Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.   Applicant's submission filed on

10/23/2006 has been entered.

      Claims 1, 13 and 25 have been amended.   Claims 2, 14 and 26 have been

cancelled. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-25 and 27-40 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to
> a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1, 3-13, 15-25 and 27-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Burns et al. (US 6,298,373), hereinafter "Burns", in view of

Ramaley et al. (US 7,100,106), hereinafter "Ramaley".

4.   As to claim 1, **Burns** teaches a method for managing data stored in a data storage device connected to a computer, comprising:

determining that a web page to be cached, wherein the web page references other objects *(a policy manager 128 which defines and administers rules that determine which documents or resources, i.e., web pages, are cached in the cache memory 124,* for instance, a Web page *which references other objects such as images, audio or video tiles* from a frequently visited Web site)* **(Burns, col. 10, lines 48-55)**;

storing the referenced objects in one or more data stores *(if the Web page references or includes continuous data files, such as audio or video files, these referenced files are stored in a continuous media server CMS 126)* **(Burns, col. 5, lines 8-20)**;

caching the web page in a cache *(caching the content received from the content provider, i.e., caching the frequently requested Web page in the cache memory 124 based on the policy manager 128)* **(Burns, col. 10, lines 48-55)**; and

automatically managing the cached web page and the referenced objects to ensure the display of a complete web page *(the target specifications embedded in the Web page to reference the continuous data files are modified/managed to reference the local copy of the continuous data files so that the continuous video/audio data stream can be rendered just-in-time by the subscriber, i.e., to ensure the display of a complete web page with all the referenced objects)* **(Burns, col. 9, line 42 – col. 10, line 10)**.

However, **Burns** does not explicitly teach when one or more of the referenced objects is deleted, deleting the web page from the cache.

In an analogous art, **Ramaley** teaches a system and method of mirroring operations performed on linked files and folders, wherein whenever a file operation *(e.g., delete, cut, copy, move, undo, restore, etc.)* performed on a primary file 302 *(i.e., a web page)* is also performed on the supporting files 200, 202 and 204 *(i.e., referenced objects)* and the folder 300 containing the supporting files. Similarly, any supporting files/folder operation performed on the supporting files/folder is also performed on the primary file 302 *(i.e., delete web pages that contain deleted referenced objects and vice versa)* **(Ramaley, Abstract, col. 6, lines 23-45 and col. 7, lines 29-55)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the features of one or more of the referenced objects is deleted, deleting the web page from the cache and vice versa, as disclosed by **Ramaley**, into the teaching of **Burns**, since both references are both directed to handling/managing web pages and their supporting files, hence, would be considered to be analogous based on their related endeavor. One would be motivated to do so to help the system and users to store and manage primary files such as main HTML files and web pages as well as their corresponding support files as a single entity **(Ramaley, col. 7, line 56 – col. 8, line 9)**.

5.   As to claim 3, **Burns-Ramaley** teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising, when the web page is deleted from the cache, deleting the referenced objects **(Ramaley, Abstract, col. 6, lines 23-45 and col. 7, lines 29-55)**. The same motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply equally well to claim 3.

6.   As to claim 4, **Burns-Ramaley** teaches the method of claim 1, further

comprising:

receiving a request to generate a dynamic web page *(receiving a request for the*

CNN Web page from the first subscriber of 6:40 AM); and

retrieving data and placing the data in a dynamically generated web page *(the*

local service provider 110 retrieves and serves the Web page, with hyperlinks to various

data items, such as audio and/or video clips, from the cached memory 124) **(Burns,**

col. 9, line 42 – col. 10, line 10).

7.   As to claims 5-6, **Burns-Ramaley** teaches the method of claim 4, wherein

managing the cached web page and referenced objects comprises the steps of:

receiving a request from an administrator to delete the retrieved data *(or linked*

objects) based on administrator-provided input *(time-to-live "TTL" tags are computed by*

the local service providers and assigned to the content to assist in determining when the

content should be refreshed or disposed/deleted) **(Burns, col. 10, line 59 – col. 11,**

line 19); and

deleting   the   retrieved   data   *(or   linked   objects)*   based   on   the

administrator-provided input *(deletion policies are a function of the content itself, i.e., the*

content will be deleted when its "TTL" tag assigned by the administrator of local service

providers expires, and/or by how frequently the content is requested, etc.) **(Burns, col.**

10, line 59 – col. 11, line 19).

8.   As to claim 7, **Burns-Ramaley** teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising, processing a caching directive that specifies whether the web page should be cached *(a policy manager 128 defines and administers rules that determine which documents, i.e., web pages, are cached in the cache memory 124)* **(Burns, col. 10, lines 48-55)**.

9.   As to claims 8-9, **Burns-Ramaley** teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising, associating an expiration timestamp with the web page, wherein the expiration timestamp defines a time period in which the cached web page is valid and automatically deleting the web page and the referenced objects when the expiration timestamp precedes a current timestamp *(time-to-live "TTL" tags are computed and assigned to the content to assist in determining when the content should be refreshed or disposed, i.e., when the time-to-live "TTL" expires, the content is no longer valid and should be updated or deleted)* **(Burns, col. 10, line 59 – col. 11, line 19)**.

10.   As to claim 11, **Burns-Ramaley** teaches the method of claim 8, wherein managing the cached web page and referenced objects comprising:

receiving a request from an administrator to delete all cached web pages according to some administrator-specified selection criteria *(the local service providers, i.e., the administrators, might compute the "TTL" tags for the content, i.e., for the cached web pages, it caches in cache memory based on some specified selection criteria)* **(Burns, col. 10, line 65 – col. 11, line 14)**; and

deleting all cached web pages and referenced objects that satisfy the administrator-specified selection criteria *(deletion policies are a function of the content itself, for example, when the "TTL" set by the administrator expires, how frequently the content is requested, etc., the content will be deleted)* **(Burns, col. 11, lines 15-19).**

11.   Claims 10 and 12 recite method claims contain similar limitations as method claim 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

12.   As to claim 37, **Burns** teaches the method of claim 1, wherein at least one of the referenced objects is not stored in said cache *(the audio and video clips referenced by the hyperlinks are stored in the content media server CMS 126)* **(Burns, col. 9, lines 45-48).**

13.   Claims 13, 15-24 and 38 are corresponding apparatus claims of method claims 1, 3-12 and 37; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

14.   Claims 25, 27-36 and 39 are corresponding article of manufacture claims of method claims 1, 3-12 and 37; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

15.   As to claim 40, **Burns-Ramaley** teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the cached web page and the referenced objects are automatically managed ensuring the display of a complete web page by referencing a dependency table storing relation

information for the cached web page and the referenced objects *(a conversion table can be constructed which converts requests from referencing the files at the "original" Web site to referencing the files in the "local" CMS 126, <u>inherently, the conversion table must have included the "original" links to the target data content at the "original" Web site and the "modified" links to the target data content at the "local" CMS 126, wherein both "original" and "modified" links are associated/embedded with/within the corresponding cached web page,</u> i.e., containing relation information for the cached web page and the referenced objects)* **(Burns, col. 9, lines 52-65).**

Conclusion

16.   Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 10/23/2006 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

17.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Rosenzweig (US 2001/0034814 A1) discloses various methods of caching web resources include caching in accordance with a number of times accessed, a frequency of access, or duration of access.

- Batchelder et al. (US 6,351,767) discloses a caching method and system for automatically caching dynamic content based on a cacheability determination based on time, content, user identification, etc.

- Gurijala et al. (US 6,601,090) discloses a system and method for servicing Internet object accesses from a coupled intranet.

18.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quang N. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
AU – 2141